South Carolina Department of Education

Together, we can.

November 19, 2007

Dr. Jo Anne Anderson
Education Oversight Committee
Room 227, Blatt Building
Columbia, S C 29211

Dear Dr. Anderson:

On behalf of the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE), I would like to thank the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) for its review of the End-of-Course United States History and the Constitution (USHC) test and the South Carolina Alternate Assessment (SC-Alt). The conduct of these reviews required a commitment by many educators in South Carolina, the staff of the Accountability Division, and the staff of the SCDE. I appreciate the dedication and time each of these individuals devoted.

The remainder of this letter addresses your recommendations.

The End-of-Course United States History and the Constitution test

Recommendation 1: The State Department of Education (SDE) should take actions to improve the alignment among the U.S. History and Constitution course standards, the instruction of those standards, and the End of Course test. Prior to EOC approval the SDE should provide evidence for the enactment of those actions to the EOC. The actions to improve the alignment may include, in addition to other possible activities:

- Examine the course standards and End of Course test to identify or affirm the essential content to be learned and tested;
- Complete the development of the Teacher's Guide, including guides for effectively pacing instruction, to the U.S. History and the Constitution course standards and End-of-Course test.

SCDE Response to Recommendation 1: Efforts to address the issue regarding the identification of essential content to be learned and tested is underway.

In October 2006, the EOC conducted an independent committee review of the EOCEP USHC test forms. The EOC report, dated December 11, 2006, stated that the EOCEP USHC test was "... well aligned with the academic standards, provides cognitive challenges at the levels specified in the

standards document, and addresses at least some of the social science literacy elements assessed earlier in the Palmetto Achievement Challenge

Tests (PACT) testing program as well as those associated specifically with high level learning activities." Therefore the SCDE will focus attention on producing an Enhanced Standards Support Document and assisting districts and schools in aligning instruction with the curriculum standards through a series of regional Standards Support Institutes and other professional development offerings.

In September 2007, the SCDE conducted a study of the USHC test results from 2006–07. The EOC staff and the subcommittee on Standards and Assessment requested to see the results of this study. Details of this study are included in this memo as Attachment A. The data show, not surprisingly, that students who indicated that they were enrolled in Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses scored higher on the USHC test than students who coded that they were enrolled in United States History and the Constitution or college prep. A second comparison showed no significant difference in scores for students who were enrolled in year-long and semester-long courses. Additionally, rescaling the test after removing the final two standards (The Cold War and the Modern Era) made little appreciable difference in student scores.

Assistance for teachers in aligning the USHC curriculum and instructional practice continues to be a need articulated in many forms. The SCDE remains committed to meeting these needs and, in turn, those of South Carolina students. Continued staff development to districts and the completion of the Enhanced Standards Support Document will proceed as planned. In addition to the ten USHC items that were released as part of the USHC Teacher's Guide (one per standard), the Office of Assessment will release additional test items to include one item from each specific indicator, bringing the total to forty-four released items.

<u>Recommendation 2: Continue the administration of the US History and Constitution End of Course test as a field test and provide feedback to schools and districts on the performance of all their students.</u>

SCDE Response to Recommendation 2: The SCDE is notifying districts that the EOCEP USHC test will be administered as an implementation test for the 2007–08 school year. The SCDE uses the term implementation for the EOCEP program when the test is administered to the designated population but the scores are not required to count as twenty percent of the student's grade. Students will receive their USHC scores for the 2007–08 school year (including summer 2008) at the same time as the schedule established for the other EOCEP tests.

<u>Recommendation 3: The actions undertaken to improve the alignment among the standards, instruction, and the test should be accomplished by June 2008 to allow for professional development activities with teachers during summer 2008.</u>

SCDE Response to Recommendation 3: Teachers began using the 2005 content standards and the accompanying Standards Support document for the first time during the 05–06 school year. The USHC EOCEP Teacher's Guide was released in October 2006. At the request of educators, in March 2007, the Office of Academic Standards began creating the Enhanced Standards Support Document in a format akin to the recently developed Standards Support Document for science. The enhanced document will include information to assist teachers with providing instruction on all the standards. Drafts of the new sections of the document will be posted to the SCDE Web site in January 2008. Other sections will be posted as they are completed throughout the remainder of the school year. The document will be completed by June 2008 in compliance with EOC recommendations.

South Carolina Alternate Assessment

Recommendation 1: The South Carolina State Department of Education (SCDE) should review the SC-Alt ELA and Mathematics items which were "flagged" for their statistical values, especially those items flagged for Differential Item Functioning, to identify reasons for the statistical aberrations observed and to identify the need to revise or eliminate the items from the assessments.

SCDE Response to Recommendation 1: The evaluation of the psychometric characteristics of the items of the SC-Alt was a multi-step process. The ELA and mathematics items were field tested in the spring of 2006 and a comprehensive review of the item data was conducted July 10–11, 2006. The field test item data review committee included members of the psychometric staff of the American Institutes of Research (AIR) and members of the alternate assessment unit, the psychometric unit, content specialists, a low incidence special education specialist, and an ELL specialist from the SCDE. The committee followed accepted practices for item data reviews by carefully reviewing every item which had reached the level of a statistical flag. The review included studying the item text and the scoring procedure for the item, a review of the test administrator comments for the item and task, and a consideration of whether the item's performance may have been the result of a lack of instruction. The content of items that were flagged in the differential item functioning (DIF) analyses was carefully examined to determine if content or stimulus materials could be the reasons that performance on the item might have favored a particular reference group. The review of the content of the items to detect possible item bias was the second review for this purpose, since all items selected for field testing had been reviewed for bias and subgroup sensitivity previously.

The DIF analyses of the items on the SC-Alt provided for a statistical evaluation of the functioning of the items for the Black versus White, and Female versus Male subgroups. Information on the analyses used for DIF and the interpretation of item DIF flags is presented in Attachment B. Many items and some whole tasks were rejected after the field test item data review based on the findings of the committee. These items were therefore not

considered for use in the spring 2007 operational form. Most of these items and tasks were determined to have multiple problems. This was the case for many items flagged for DIF in the field test data. Most items flagged for DIF in the field test data were not selected for inclusion on the operational forms. A few of the DIF flagged items were included on the operational forms when the committee could not determine a likely content reason for the item to favor a black–white or gender subgroup.

Documentation on all items flagged for DIF in the field test data and the resulting disposition of the items (i.e., use or non-use in the operational forms) is provided in Attachment C, Tables 1 and 2 for ELA and mathematics, respectively. The tables also provide the results of the 2007 operational DIF analyses for all items that were included in the operational forms.

As indicated in the tables, very few of the items flagged for DIF in the 2006 data that were selected for inclusion on the operational forms were flagged for DIF in the 2007 analyses. Of the three items flagged for DIF in the 2007 data (one for ELA and two for math), only one item had a pattern of DIF results consistent with the 2006 indices.

All items receiving classical and IRT item statistic flags from the 2007 operational administration were reviewed by AIR and SCDE staff following item scoring and prior to standard setting. The purpose of the review was to further evaluate the items to determine if there was evidence that flawed items had been included in the operational forms. Since all the 2007 items had been reviewed previously with data from the 2006 field test, there would need to be strong evidence for a significant item flaw, confirmed by review of item content, before the item would be considered for elimination from operational scoring.

The review of the 2007 item data was conducted by two staff members of the special education unit in the Office of Assessment. All items flagged for any statistical criteria were reviewed, but particular attention was given to items flagged for DIF. The review of items flagged for DIF consisted of examining the field test item data for each item to determine if the item had been flagged for DIF in a consistent way in the 2006 data and examining the content and stimulus materials for each. Documentation on all items flagged for DIF in the 2007 data is provided in Attachment C, Tables 3 and 4 for ELA and mathematics, respectively.

Seven ELA items out of a total of 197 items used on the three operational forms were flagged for DIF in the 2007 data. Only one of the 2007 items had been flagged for DIF in the 2006 data with consistent results (i.e., favoring the same subgroup). This item was ITS ID 331, which was flagged for DIF differential performance favoring males. This item was used on both the elementary and middle school forms and was flagged for DIF only on the middle school form. The content and stimulus materials of all ELA items flagged for DIF were reviewed, and there were no content findings that could

be reasoned to be suggestive of supporting the DIF statistic for all items except one.

Nine mathematics items out of a total of 168 items used on the three operational forms were flagged for DIF in the 2007 data. Only one of the 2007 DIF flagged items had been flagged for DIF in the 2006 data with consistent results. This item was ITS ID 317, which was flagged for DIF suggesting differential performance favoring black students. The content and stimulus materials of all mathematics items flagged for DIF were reviewed, and there were no content findings that could be reasoned to be suggestive of supporting the DIF statistic for all items except one.

The review of the 2006 item data and item content for each of the flagged 2007 items did not yield substantial evidence for item bias for any of the items. Based on this review, the decision was made to retain all items in the operational scoring for 2007 and for inclusion in the 2008 assessment, but to conduct a follow-up review of the data for these items from the 2008 administration

Recommendation 2: The SDE should develop and disseminate updated professional development guides and materials related to the Assessment Standards and Measurement Guidelines and the SC-Alt assessments, including information to assist teachers to align their instruction with the Assessment Standards and Measurement Guidelines.

SCDE Response to Recommendation 2: The SCDE has begun the process of developing a guidance document to accompany the Assessment Standards and Measurement Guidelines. This document is scheduled for completion prior to the beginning of the 2008 school year.

Guidance Documents
A committee of special educators, content specialists, and parents met July 23–25, 2007 to begin developing the document based on the revised ELA and math standards. Dr. Diane Browder, a nationally recognized expert on access to the general education curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities provided professional development and guidance to this group.

Dr. Browder, with the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC) is author of the book *Teaching Language Arts, Math and Science to Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities* and principal investigator of the *Reading Accommodations and Interventions for Students with Emergent Literacy (RAISE*), a program to accelerate reading development and promote access to the general reading curriculum for students with moderate to severe mental disabilities. She and her team at UNCC have undertaken a series of studies aimed at finding ways to teach academic content standards linked to grade level content standards to students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Following the training, Dr. Browder and her colleagues facilitated the process of identifying how standards can be addressed for students with varying levels of communication ability, from pre-symbolic to symbolic. The group considered each math and ELA standard and indicator and determined three levels of communication access: symbolic, concrete, and pre-symbolic for each indicator.

A follow up meeting was held on November 6 to continue the work on the document to support grade level instruction for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. At the completion of the guide for ELA and math, the group will design a similar document for the science and social studies Assessment Standards and Measurement Guidelines. It is anticipated that this work will continue through the summer of 2008 and that the documents will be ready for dissemination for the 2008 school year.

Professional Development
Additionally, Dr. Browder has conducted three state wide training sessions on access to the general education curriculum in ELA, math, and science for teachers of students with moderate to severe disabilities. The Offices of Assessment and Exceptional Children are collaborating on developing going training for teachers on access to the general education curriculum and use of the guidance documents.

These measures are designed to ensure that students participating in the alternate assessment have access to instruction based on grade level academic standards. These initiatives should enhance understanding for teachers of ways to provide meaningful access to instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Jones, Interim Director
Office of Assessment

EAJ/jsh

cc: Jim Rex, State Superintendent, SCDE
Teri Siskind, Deputy Superintendent, SCDE

Attachment A
Student Results by Type of Course

Students Coded as Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB)

Letter Grade Equivalent	AP	IB	AP + IB	Percent
A	12	247	259	9.01
B	23	665	688	23.92
C	58	880	938	32.61
D	33	583	616	21.41
F	27	348	375	13.03
Total	153	2723	2876	

Students Coded as U.S. History (USH) or College Prep (CP)

Letter Grade Equivalent	USH	CP	USH + CP	Percent
A	119	55	174	0.46
B	607	139	746	1.99
C	2520	623	3143	8.37
D	5406	1436	6842	18.23
F	22091	4543	26634	70.95
Total	30743	6796	37539	

Students coded as Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) scored substantially better than students coded as U. S. History (USH) or College Prep (CP).

The SCDE was notified that a group of students in one local high school (supposedly IB students but coded as AP) protested the USHC test and darkened bubbles so that their answer sheets looked like a Christmas tree. Out of the thirty-nine students in the group, only one passed; all the others had chance-level scores. This group was removed from the analyses reported above. The correction, without these students, reduces slightly the percentage of AP and IB students failing the test (from 14.17 to 13.03 percent).

Most students in the file were coded as USH or CP. These two groups were quite similar in performance: the CP group had a less than one percentage point advantage in As, Bs, and Cs; about five percentage points fewer CP students received Fs. Neither group did nearly as well as the AP/IB group.

Results from Students Enrolled in Semester-long and Year-long Courses

There was no indication in the data file indicating whether students were in a semester or year-long course. The SCDE assumed that, except for AP/IB courses, schools do not offer both semester and year-long courses during the same year. Schools with fall test results were assumed to be offering semester courses only. Schools with only spring scores were assumed to have only year-long courses. This breakdown was consistent with survey data on course length.

Looking at all students (via ANOVA), the year-long group scored slightly higher.

Type	Mean Scale Score	F	P
Semester	66.814	10.23	0.0014
Year-long	67.122		(Sig.)

However, all AP/IB courses are year-long. Since they are the higher scoring group and therefore, were only included in the spring results, including their scores bias the data. Without the AP/IB student's scores, there is no significant difference in results from students taking semester and year-long courses.

Type	Mean Scale Score	F	P
Semester	65.913	0.00	0.9913
Year-long	65.914		(N. S.)

Therefore, taking a semester or year-long course doesn't have a significant effect on the EOCEP scores. Even including the AP/IB students, a mean difference of 0.31 scale score points may not have much practical significance.

Re-scaling the test without the last two standards

This is the most substantive of the analyses. The Rasch difficulties for the items were taken from the data bank. The contractor's original scaling of the fall 2006 and spring 2007 test forms was duplicated. The SCDE and contractor's thetas matched exactly to two decimal places, with the SCDE thetas occasionally differing by one in the third decimal place. This can easily be attributed to rounding. The raw to scale score conversion difference affected only one score. That score was well within the failing range, and therefore had no practical significance. The eleven items assessing the final two standards (standards nine and ten) were removed from both the fall and spring forms. Next, the shortened forms were calibrated using the forty-four remaining items and scale scores were assigned, based on the new thetas. The adjusted scales scores from the shortened forms were assigned to all students in the dataset. The results from a dependent t-test (shown in the

tables below) were used to compare the students' original and adjusted scale scores for the spring and fall forms.

Fall Administration (with AP/IB students included)

Test	Mean Scale Score	t	P
Original	65.912	9.61	<.0001
Adjusted	65.739		(Sig.)

Spring Administration (with AP/IB students included)

Test	Mean Scale Score	t	P
Original	67.339	1.78	.0749
Adjusted	67.319		(N. S.)

The students scored slightly better on the original, full length form than they did on the adjusted, shortened form. The AP/IB students were removed and the tests were repeated.

Fall Administration (without AP/IB students included)

Test	Mean Scale Score	t	P
Original	65.681	10.99	<.0001
Adjusted	65.483		(Sig.)

Spring Administration (without AP/IB students included)

Test	Mean Scale Score	t	P
Original	66.016	0.94	.3478
Adjusted	66.027		(N. S.)

The results are mixed, when the AP and IB students are not included. Students scored significantly better on the original fall form. However, on the spring forms, students scored slightly, but not significantly, better on the adjusted form. In both cases, the size of the mean difference was small.

For both fall and spring, the percentage of students receiving an A is slightly higher on the adjusted form (by less than one half of a percentage point).

The bank difficulties for the items aligned to standards nine and ten do not appear to be exceptionally difficult based on a review of the bank. Most are of above-average difficulty (more so on the fall form than on the spring form), but both forms have some items aligned to standards nine and ten that are relatively easy. For both forms, the very hardest item is not aligned to standards nine or ten.

Therefore, the data indicate that removing items aligned to standards nine and ten would not substantially improve performance on the test. However, removing the final two standards could affect instruction, in that many teachers may not continue their instruction up to the present day.

Attachment B

American Institute for Research employs a design consistent Mantel-Haenszel procedure (Holland, 1985; Holland & Thayer, 1988) to conduct DIF analyses. The total score is divided into five intervals to compute the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) chi-square DIF statistics. The analysis program computes the MH chi-square value, the log-odds ratio, the standard error of the log-odds ratio, and the MH-delta for the MC items; the MH chi-square, the standardized mean difference (SMD), and the standard error of the SMD for the CR items. The purification method described by Holland and Thayer (1986) is included in the DIF procedure. Items are classified into three categories (A, B, or C) ranging from no DIF to mild DIF to severe DIF according to the DIF classification convention. Items are also categorized as positive DIF (i.e., +A, +B, or +C) signifying the item favors the focal group, or negative DIF (i.e., –A, –B, or –C) signifying the item favors the reference group.

We modified the typical Mantel-Haenszel procedure to be consistent with our stratified random sample design. Complex sample designs violate the assumptions on which the simple random sample test statistics are based.

Items are classified into three categories ranging from no DIF to mild DIF to severe DIF according to common DIF classification conventions according to the following rules. If the p-value of $MH\chi^2$ value is < .05 then the DIF indicator is either "B" or "C"

Dichotomous Items	
Category	Rule
C	$MH\chi^2$ is significant and $\lvert\hat{\Delta}_{MH}\rvert \geq 1.5$
B	$MH\chi^2$ is significant and $\lvert\hat{\Delta}_{MH}\rvert < 1.5$
A	$MH\chi^2$ is not significant.
Polytomous Items	
Category	Rule
C	$MH\chi^2$ is significant and $\lvert SMD\rvert / \lvert SD\rvert \geq .25$.
B	$MH\chi^2$ is significant and $\lvert SMD\rvert / \lvert SD\rvert < .25$.
A	$MH\chi^2$ is not significant.

Attachment C
Table 1
ELA Items Flagged for DIF on 2006 Field Test Forms and DIF Status on the 2007 Operational Forms

ITS ID	Task	2006 Field Test			2007 Operational		
		Items Flagged for DIF			Included/ Form	DIF Results	
		Number of Forms	B-W	F-M		B-W	F-M
50	Animals in the Yard	1 of 6	-C	-A	ES	-A	+A
55	Animals in the Yard	1 of 6	-A	-C	ES	-A	-A
65	I'll Share	1 of 1	+B	-C	Not Included		
134	Pete is Tired	1 of 6	-A	+C	ES	+A	+A
135	Pete is Tired	1 of 6	+C	+A	ES	+A	+A
182	Today's Weather	1 of 1	+C	+A	MS	+A	+A
					HS	+A	-A
278	Hand Washing	1 of 1	+C	+A	Not Included		
284	Today's Weather	1 of 1	+C	-A	Not Included		
355	Favorite Things	1 of 3	+A	-C	ES	-A	+A
					MS	+A	+A
433	Getting Ready for Bed	1 of 1	+C	-A	HS	+A	-B
436	Getting Ready for Bed	1 of 1	+A	-C	HS	-A	+A
440	School Signs	1 of 3	-A	-C	MS	+A	-A
					HS	-A	-A
441	School Signs	1 of 3	+A	-C	MS	+A	-A
					HS	+A	-A
467	Setting the Table	1 of 1	+C	+A	Not Included		
508	Making a Job Chart	1 of 6	+A	-C	Not included		
509	Making a Job Chart	1 of 6	+C	-C	Not Included		
524	Sale Ads	1 of 3	+C	-A	HS	+A	+A
525	Sale Ads	1 of 3	+C	-A	HS	+A	+A
526	Sale Ads	1 of 3	+A	-C	HS	+A	-A
527	Sale Ads	1 of 3	+A	-C	HS	+A	-A
527	Sale Ads	1 of 3	-A	-C			
552	Pet Poem	1 of 1	+C	-C	ES	+A	+A
564	Two Stories	1 of 3	+C	+A	HS	+A	-A
568	Word Study	1 of 1	-C	-A	Not Included		
569	Word Study	1 of 1	-C	-A	Not Included		
628	Manatees	1 of 1	-C	+A	HS	+C	+A
676	Making a Job Chart	1 of 6	+A	-C	Not Included		
684	Setting the Table	1 of 1	+C	-A	Not Included		

Table 2
Mathematics Items Flagged for DIF on 2006 Field Test Forms
and DIF Status on the 2007 Operational Forms

ITS ID	Task	2006 Field Test			2007 Operational		
		Items Flagged for DIF			Included/ Form	DIF Results	
		Number of Forms	B-W	F-M		B-W	F-M
13	One, Two, More, Less	1 of 1	+A	-C	ES	+A	+A
					MS	+A	+A
					HS	+A	+A
104	Ranking by Size	1 of 6	-A	-C	Not Included		
118	Ranking by Size	1 of 6	+C	-A	Not Included		
149	Describing locations #2	1 of 1	-A	-C	Not Included		
152	Describing Locations #2	1 of 1	+A	-C	Not Included		
317	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	+C	-A	MS	-A	-A
317	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	+C	+A	HS	+C	-A
321	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	+C	+A	MS	-A	+A
321	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	-A	-C	HS	-A	-A
322	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	+C	+A	MS	+A	-A
					HS	+A	-A
352	Sort and Classify Objects	1 of 1	+C	-A	ES	+A	+A
					MS	+A	-A
364	Calendar	1 of 1	-A	-C	Not Included		
371	Tom's and Susan's Pencils	1 of 3	+A	-C	Not Included		
382	Adding and Subtracting to Tell a Story	1 of 1	+C	+A	Not Included		
383	Adding and Subtracting to Tell a Story	1 of 1	+A	+C	Not Included		
385	Adding and Subtracting to Tell a Story	1 of 1	+C	-A	Not Included		
416	What's the Sign?	1 of 1	+C	-A	Not Included		
461	Bus/Car Graph	1 of 1	+A	-C	MS	-A	+A
					HS	+A	-A
528	Paper Clip Graph	1 of 1	+C	-A	HS	+A	-A
639	Measurement Readiness	1 of 1	+A	+C	ES	-A	-A
					MS	+A	+A
					HS	+C	+A
641	Same/Different Readiness	1 of 3	+A	+C	ES	+A	+A
					MS	+A	-A
					HS	+A	+A
643	Same/Different Number	1 of 1	+C	-A	Not Included		
645	Same/Different Readiness	1 of 3	+A	+C	ES	-A	-A
					MS	-A	+A
					HS	+A	+A
674	Same/Different Readiness	1 of 3	+C	+A	ES	-A	+A
					MS	+A	+A
					HS	-A	+A

Table 3
ELA Items Flagged for DIF on the 2007 Operational Forms and DIF Status on the 2006 Field Test

ITS ID	Task	2006 Field Test			2007 Operational		
		Number of Forms	DIF Results		Form	DIF Results	
			B-W	F-M		B-W	F-M
331	Favorite Things	1 of 3	-A	+A	ES	-A	+A
		1 of 3	+A	-B	MS	-A	-C
		1 of 3	+A	-A			
437	Getting Ready for Bed	1 of 1	+A	-A	HS	+C	-A
449	Movie Schedule	1 of 1	-A	+A	HS	+C	-A
526	Sale Ads	1 of 3	-A	-A	HS	+C	-A
		1 of 3	+A	+A			
		1 of 3	+A	-C			
628	Manatees	1 of 1	-C	+A	HS	+C	+A
632	Every Sunday Afternoon	1 of 1	-A	+A	MS	-A	+A
					HS	+C	+A
664	Every Sunday Afternoon	1 of 1	+A	-A	MS	-A	+C
					HS	+C	-A

Table 4
Mathematics Items Flagged for DIF on the 2007 Operational Forms and DIF Status on the 2006 Field Test

ITS ID	Task	2006 Field Test			2007 Operational		
		Items Flagged for DIF			Form	DIF Results	
		Number of Forms	B-W	F-M		B-W	F-M
35	Comparing Numbers	1 of 1	-A	-A	HS	+C	-A
79	Comparing Numbers	1 of 1	+A	-A	HS	+C	-A
126	Describing Locations	1 of 3	-A	+B	EL	+A	+A
		1 of 3	+A	-A	MS	+A	-A
		1 of 3	-A	-A	HS	+C	+A
222	How Likely ?	1 of 1	-A	+A	HS	+C	-C
286	About How Many	1 of 1	+A	-A	HS	+A	-C
287	About How Many	1 of 1	-A	-A	HS	+A	-C
317	Patterns with Objects	1 of 6	+C	-A	MS	-A	-A
		1 of 6	+C	+A	HS	+C	-A
		3 of 6	-A	-A			
		1 of 6	+A	-A			
529	Paper Clip Graph	1 of 1	+A	-A	HS	+C	+C
639	Measurement Readiness	1 of 1	+A	+C	ES	-A	-A
					MS	+A	+A
					HS	+C	+A